UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Gandhi Goes to Prison Again

By

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR

VOLUME CXI NUMBER 21

Chicago, August 21, 1933

PRICE TEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

Published Weekly October to June — *Subscription $3.00*
Published Bi-Weekly July to September — *Single Copies 10 cents*

UNITY PUBLISHING CO., Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.
"Entered as Second-Class Matter July 30, 1931, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* — CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Board of Directors

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, President
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-President
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. ELLA R. NAGELY
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MRS. E. E. SMITH
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
Secretary: MAY JOHNSON

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
EDMUND B. CHAFFEE
PERCY M. DAWSON
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
ZONA GALE
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
H. R. MUSSEY
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
FREDERICK STARR
SYDNEY STRONG
JABEZ T. SUNDERLAND
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY
JAMES H. WEST

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

ARTICLES— Page

Editorial Notes—J. H. H. 327
The New Deal and Socialism—JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE 329
Gandhi Goes to Prison Again—HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR 331
A Unique Social Worker—DORIS BAXTER 335
Mother of God—RAYMOND KRESENSKY 336

POETRY—

Abraham Lincoln Centre Revisited—BRENT ALLINSON 327
Growing Godward—MARIE FALCONER 330
Britain's Thorn—JERGEN B. OLSON 334

THE STUDY TABLE—

Human Diversity—FREDERICK STARR 337
A Book of the Prophets—J. H. H. 338

CORRESPONDENCE—

The Crazy Farm Bill:
I. C. L. PETERSEN 339
II. F. S. KINDER 339

THE FIELD—

The Why of Futility of Arms Conferences—*John Gunther*—Chicago *Daily News* 326
A Correction 340

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

The Why of Futility of Arms Conferences

The disarmament conference at Geneva is a pretty futile business so long as arms firms like Skoda make money on munitions.

"A sinister feature," Lord Cecil has said, "is the tremendous power wielded against all proposals by arms firms."

Many things contribute to the difficulties of controlling the arms traffic.

For one thing, governments themselves are directly interested in the manufacture of arms. The British government, for instance, has shares in a subsidiary of Imperial Chemical Industries and is to be kept closely in touch with matters of research, etc., in this giant firm. Governments are very sensitive about munitions affairs. Persia, it may be noted, walked out of the arms traffic conference at Geneva in 1925.

Again, influential members of governments are often stockholders in arms companies. Sir John Simon held 1,512 shares in Imperial Chemical Industries until, last month, he gave them up, following repeated protests in the house of commons. Austen Chamberlain has 666 I. C. I. shares and his brother Neville, chancellor of the British exchequer, 11,747.

Vickers has 80,000 stockholders. Among them, as of April, 1932, are two British cabinet ministers, Lord Hailsham, secretary of war, with 210, and Sir John Gilmour, minister of agriculture, with 3,066. Among the stockholders are many politicians, publicists and M. P.'s.

Again, there is the influence of the arms makers on the press. The leading firm in the Comite des Forges, the great French steel association, is Schneider-Creusot, which controls Skoda. Both the *Temps*, the leading Paris paper, and the *Journal des Debats*, are said to be controlled by members of the Comite des Forges. The *Echo de Paris* has received heavy contributions by arms firms. It was recently widely printed in Germany, but denied in France, that Schneider-Creusot had bought control of

(*Continued on page* 339)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXI MONDAY, AUGUST 21, 1933 Number 21

ABRAHAM LINCOLN CENTER REVISITED

Square Warehouse freighted with august ideas—
Looming above a wilderness of men
Thronging the sordid city's glittering fen,
Who seek and seek—who knows what liberties,
Indulgences, distractions, or heart's ease
In art or gossip or a social den
Of civic agitation to open
Doors wide to Opportunity or Peace? . . .

Memories there are that never may be stilled
Here in these austere shadows closely furled:
From Lincoln to Lenin the challenge hurled,—
Through Whitman, Tolstoy, Jones the echoes thrilled;—
O, vacant Warehouse, waiting to be filled
With color and the gladness of the world!

BRENT ALLINSON.

The cycle of the year renews itself, to remind men once again of their folly and all the evil that flows therefrom. Leave the city behind, and flee to any sequestered nook in Nature's heart—the sea, the mountain-top, the lake in the bosom of the hills, the far stretch of forests, the wide sweep of plain and prairie! Who could imagine, in any one of these places, the tragedy and trial that now brood upon the societies of men? "Is there any band of apes so stupid," said a recent public speaker, "that it would starve with cocoanuts growing in abundance on every tree?" Nature is fertile and fruitful; she supplies, in the natural round of the seasons, all that the creatures of her earth can need. But apes, and other sub-human creatures, are not stupid—neither are they wicked. One had to wait for intelligence to appear, for Nature's offspring to be defrauded of her bounty. There is no hoarding among the animals, no owning, no buying and selling. What grows is the property of all, and each consumes only to the limit of his need. But man seizes and possesses. He fences off the land, and calls it his own; he holds the fruit of the land, and shares it with his hungry brother only if that brother has the wherewithal to pay; he even leaves his acres unturned and unsown, or destroys his wheat, or plows under his cotton, if he is unable to get his price from starving and naked men. What has man not done with the wealth that God has given him! And governments are instituted among men, apparently, to pepetuate their stupidities, legalize their wickednesses, and thus back with authority the working of policies whose fundamental aim is the exploitation of man by men. We have meditated much this summer as we have gazed upon the teeming sea, surveyed the fruit-laden farms of east and west, watched the quickening sun and refreshing rain —and more and more we have come to understand the hymn-writer who spoke of how

> . . . Every prospect pleases,
> And only man is vile.

There is a nobility about Gandhi which so far transcends the nobility of other men as to render him spiritually unique. It is the sort of thing which Christians have had in mind for centuries in speaking of "the divinity of Jesus." There are some attributes of humanity, in other words, which appear so rarely, in only the few sublimest souls of history, as to seem to surpass humanity and thus become divine. The latest instance of the Mahatma's quality is seen in his resolution to discontinue his Ashram at Sabarmati. His logic in this matter, as in all such matters, has a simplicity which is as irrefutable as it is beautiful. The Ashram, said Gandhi, was "to him the most precious thing on earth." Now, in the struggle for national independence, hundreds of thousands of Indians had sacrificed everything they had in the world. This being the case, it devolved upon him to make the supreme sacrifice. And so he dissolved his college, and summoned his students and disciples to follow him in renewed struggle against the British Crown. That the Government should have chosen this moment of final renunciation to arrest Gandhi and thus renew his martyrdom for India's cause, is one more evidence of the essential stupidity of officialdom. For it needed just this fact of arrest to carry to the farthest borders not only of India but of the world the news of what the Mahatma had done. By this deed is the significance of Gandhi's life made apparent once again. Whether this great leader by his action and in his own lifetime is going to secure the emancipation of his people may still be doubtful. But that he is creating and directing the spiritual power which in due course will achieve this goal of freedom is certain. What Gandhi has done, and is doing, is to instill into the tens of millions of his countrymen a dignity of manhood, a capacity of suffering and sacrifice, an ideal of heroism, which is transforming the nation. He has raised by his own efforts and example, the moral level of an entire race, and

therewith made the Indians worthy of a liberty which now for the first time they have the power to win. In the face of such a spiritual miracle as this, what matters it whether independence come tomorrow, or the day after tomorrow? The end itself is sure.

To any person gifted with imagination, the national campaign for industrial recovery is as terrible as it is tremendous. The campaign, let it be said, is on behalf of a "war" against the depression. This is a laudable purpose, and the propaganda therefore fills us with mingled excitement and delight. The pressure behind it all is enormous—the whole weight of the government driven into this one huge endeavor! The methods of public instruction and appeal are varied and irresistible—the post-office, the radio, the movie, the newspaper, the bill-board. The mobilization of public sentiment is overwhelming—every one of us must line up and keep step, or else be penalized by just such contempt, hatred and persecution as visited the pacifists in 1917-18. The "war" against the depression has got to go over, and no nonsense about it either. Fine, *fine!* But suppose this was a war not against the depression but against Japan, or Russia, or Germany. Yes!—suppose, for reasons good and sufficient to his arbitrary self, the President desired the people of this country to take up arms not against their "sea of [economic] troubles," but against some foreign enemy across the seas. Then, in just this same way, would the administration take possession of all these modern instruments of public appeal, and drive the nation to fight as it is now driving the nation to buy and sell. What impresses us, in all this ballyhoo, is the helplessness of the people against the determination of the government to do anything it really wants to do. The present purpose of Washington is praiseworthy, but it might easily be utterly abominable. In either case, the administration has it in its power to do just what it is doing now—first, whipping up the people to tremendous excitement and enthusiasm, and secondly, terrifying the people by threats and insults to abject obedience. The one thing that cannot be tolerated is opposition, minority opinion, individual freedom of thought and action. Any one who imagines that a "next war" can be prevented under conditions like this, is a good deal of a simpleton.

President Roosevelt surely must recognize Russia, if only in acknowledgment of and gratitude for all that he has taken over from the land of the Soviets. For the New Deal, as now conceived and fashioned, is only a very moderate form of the Five Year Plan adapted to American conditions of crisis. And similar are the methods used to put over the campaign, as described in the above editorial. If one would see the perfect model of the propaganda ballyhoo now engulfing the country, let him turn to Moscow and study the publicity devices employed by the Kremlin since 1927. If one would see terrorization of opinion and mobilization of action as conducted by past-masters of the art, he need only journey to Bolsheviki-land and watch what is going on. The administration, like all imitators, is a good deal of a bungler at this sort of thing. Americans are docile enough, but their leaders are still infected by certain scruples of democratic principle and ideal from which the Russian commissars are altogether delivered. So the New Deal is all a very weak reproduction of the genuine article. But the identity is there—if there were an international code of law Stalin could sue Roosevelt for plagiarism! And the important thing is that Americans should know what is going on. To this end nothing could be so effective as formal recognition of the Soviet republic. Let the President say what he ought to say—"After a decade and a half of stupidity, we have discovered that you are right. My administration has adopted your program of a planned economy, I am putting it over *a la Kremlin,* and the American Chamber of Commerce and the American Federation of Labor are together rising up to call you blessed. Send over your ambassador, and let me embrace him!"

The American Civil Liberties Union, in its recent Annual Report, pays deserved tribute to the Roosevelt administration for its liberal attitude on questions involving the basically American doctrine of civil rights. The change from the Hoover regime was dramatized by the treatment of the two bonus expeditions by the two Presidents. Of Mr. Hoover's action in calling out the Army and dispersing the expeditioners by force and violence the Union well declares that "no single event so strikingly violative of civil rights has been chargeable in recent years to the federal government." Mr. Roosevelt, in contrast, was just and generous, and as a result got rid of the marchers with far less trouble. Other evidences of liberalism are numerous. The Post Office Department, for example, seems to have decided under present conditions and control to suspend its dangerous exercise of the power of censorship. Miss Perkins, of the Department of Labor, has discontinued altogether the highhanded and lawless drives conducted against aliens by her predecessor, Mr. Doak. It is an enlightened spirit which now prevails in Washington—in all save the operation of the National Recovery Act which promises repression a-plenty unless present policies are changed. In the meantime it should be noted that this Act has had, for the moment at least, a most beneficent effect on working-class rights. The report of the Civil Liberties Union on this point is worth quoting in full:

> With the enormous extension in power and control by the federal government under a rapidly developing regime of state capitalism, open attacks by employers on working-class rights are likely to be far less. Already the shift in initiative from private business to the government has checked them. That this unprecedented increase in state power has not been ac-

companied by suppression, as in other countries, is due obviously to the fact that there is no real opposition to suppress. It may be remarked that the United States is the only country in the world which has entered this transition from private to state capitalism without conflict.

We are reminded that this month, August, 1933, marks the one hundredth anniversary of the abolition of slavery under the British flag. What was accomplished in America only at the cost of a great civil war which wiped out a million lives, destroyed billions of dollars' worth of property, and ruined a third of the nation for a generation, was accomplished in the British Empire by a simple act of legislation. The Civil War, in other words, was as unnecessary as it was costly. It is exciting to remember that behind what has been called this "almost incredible achievement" in England was a great and good man who dedicated his life to the cause of the bondman. William Wilberforce, whose body was laid to rest in Westminster Abbey just a week after the tidings of emancipation were brought to his dying ears, was less than thirty years of age when he took up the fight against slavery. A man of high birth and wide culture, of charming and lovable personality, the friend of Pitt, Fox, and Edmund Burke, of lofty mind, pure heart, and indefatigable energy and heroic sacrifice, Wilberforce was ideally fitted to lead the movement which in course of time became uniquely identified with his name. Associated for years with Thomas Clarkson in the great fight against the African slave trade, he had the satisfaction of seeing the trade abolished by the act of Parliament which received the royal assent on March 25, 1806. Many weary years were to intervene before slavery itself was done away with on British soil. The Napoleonic wars and the confused aftermath of these wars distracted attention and exhausted energy. But in 1833 the great deed was done, and Wilberforce, like our own Garrison, lived to witness the consummation of his life's labors. The story of Wilberforce's career is one of the immortal hero-stories of English history, and the man himself one of the noblest figures in the annals of humankind. It is inspiring, in days like these, to mark this golden milestone on the rough highway of human progress.

The New Deal and Socialism

The product of the New Deal will be a social mongrel. No group of doctrinaires will be satisfied with it. This should not be disconcerting,—except to the doctrinaires. No social organization on earth is altogether true to any one type, nor doubtless ever will be.

The tendencies of the new order are manifestly towards a higher degree of socialization all along the line. Yet few who intelligently call themselves Socialists are enthusiastic over these tendencies. Reactionaries, and those who worship at the shrine of rugged individualism, are shaking their heads already, and will soon be shouting aloud their dissent from the philosophy back of these tendencies. They are beginning to mutter against the "socialistic" doings practiced and encouraged at Washington.

Thoroughly indoctrinated Socialists laugh at these allegations and their alarms. The New Deal is not a counsel of Socialism, Marxians being judges. Which brings up one point of present remark. Those of us who are not committed to the Marxian social philosophy cannot help but regret that our good word, Socialism, has been so conclusively appropriated for a set of doctrines which stake much, if not all, on method, and forbid keeping our eye single to results, ends, the social essence.

If the socialistic state should be achieved in this country, or anywhere, by pacific means and common counsels, it would not be a socialistic triumph, according to Marxians; it would not be Socialism. For Socialism can be brought in only through class conflict, and the forcible if not violent victory of a militant proletariat. The socialization of any industrial order through common consent and the co-operative effort of all classes, no matter how precisely it might present the aspects of the order adumbrated by Socialism, would not be a true Socialism, because it was not ushered in by the alleged inevitable class conflict.

The New Deal is achieving a high degree of industrial socialization, as already remarked. If programs now projected shall be actually achieved and confirmed in our society, at least some of the results will be amazingly like those eloquently desiderated by socialist propagandists. An intelligent and thoroughly united backing for these measures among liberal spirits in our population would insure an even farther reach in the direction of socialization. But no one expects hearty support for these measures from Communists, nor, any more, from Marxian Socialists,—the only sort of Socialists there are, the term being strictly applied.

The reason for this is that the New Deal avoids incitements to class conflict. The United States Chamber of Commerce claims as much credit for NIRA as do the labor unions. The new organization of industry leaves no class of the present industrial order out in the cold, gnashing its teeth in rage over the unceremonious manner in which it has been ejected from the common industrial household. The success of the plan is dependent upon the will and even eager co-operation of all of the several groups involved in our industrial process.

This is certainly not Socialism, whatever may be the degree of socialization of industry which may result. As already pointed out, convinced Marxians will assert that the New Deal cannot succeed, for, no matter what may be its aims, no matter how truly to Socialism's goals those aims may be directed, the Marxians must damn the program because of the pacific co-operative methods employed. This, those of us who are not Marxians, but who still acclaim the coming of socialized industry, must deplore. Probably none of the essential elements in the community idealized by Socialists would we fail to applaud, provided the virus of class bitterness is conceived to have been extracted. Just what alchemy might effect this extraction, we find it quite impossible to conceive, if Socialism should ever be successful in achieving and maintaining the commun-

ity which Marxians desiderate. How Socialists can hope latterly to eradicate a class bitterness which primarily they deliberately generate and foster, has always been beyond our comprehension. To say that the "ruling classes" compel this resort, and that they must bear the blame for the conflict, does not meet the issue. No worthy social results can be attained by locating blames. The fact is, the Marxian state can be achieved only through class conflict, and the victory leaves a residuum of social poison, however complete may be that victory.

The degree of socialization, therefore, which shall be achieved by the New Deal, is being hailed by some of us with gratification, perhaps largely because this residuum of class poison will not remain. It will not remain because it has not been generated in the first place. The spectacle of clamorous co-operation between labor unions and chambers of commerce, between directorates of massive corporations and committees of workingmen, in compounding mutually satisfactory codes for large and small industries, does stir our risibles, along with our hopes for a brighter social future. But hopes dominate the laughter. This, we believe, is the way the new social order must be ushered in, if it is to be lasting, and if "victory" is not to be damned by ineradicable rancor. We acclaim no "treaties of Versailles" in American industry.

But while the cynicism of Socialists is unbecoming, as we contemplate the prospects held out by the New Deal, extravagant hopes are not justified. One of the re-assurances of the New Deal is that it is not millennial. Probably such sweeping changes in social structure have never before been attempted with such measured band-stand performances. Relative to one project the President himself expressed some doubt, as well he might, of that particular measure. He asked the privilege of trying it, with the assurance that something else would be proposed if and when it failed.

One of the members of the "brain trust" is quoted as predicting that the administration's smooth sailing will be over by late fall. Congress in regular session, he thinks, will not be so docile as it was in the special session. He further predicts that the present administration will last only for one term, to be followed by reaction, probably by extreme reaction. Outstanding results of the New Deal, however, he believes will persist through all coming vicissitudes.

Again, it is worth remarking that no other such radical changes in social structure have been so little inspired by millennialism. While the old order was swept out with conclusive demonstration of popular ill-will, the New Deal has never been conceived as the unlicensed romp of visionary reformers. All of the community's radical elements were united in declaring that basically there was little to choose between the social aspirations of the two major parties in the 1932 election. Not in a great glow of social enthusiasm was the New Deal instituted, but rather in a profound desperation. "Let's give the other party a try-out any way; conditions cannot be made worse than they are." That was the attitude of millions of voters who helped to inaugurate the New Deal. Even today it is sustained among many critics by the warning, "This country cannot survive another financial crash." Back the new order, therefore, even against doubts and provocations to censure, because its failure will bring certain disaster. How far such sentiment floats the New Deal nobody can say. That all is serene ahead it is certain, however, nobody believes.

This very insecurity of the present situation is for some of us one of the largest elements of hope in the New Deal. How many times in our history have reform movements been swept into power in a millennial wave! And how speedily and ignominiously have they collapsed! The very fact that reaction is understood to be imminent, even by prime movers in the New Deal, is reassuring to the seasoned political observer. If we non-Marxians were disposed to press a quarrel with Socialism, we should emphasize this peril of all doctrinaire systems. If there is any conclusion which may be assuredly drawn from a review of history, it is that social progress is not consistent; forward movements never run true to arbitrarily conceived social types, never arrive right side up and sound in every limb at predestined goals.

With all of the doubts which any reasonable observer may entertain relative to the New Deal, some of us believe that somewhat along this road our secure social progress is to be attained. The drastic education in social programming which the American people are now passing through, is, at any rate, quite to the good. The prompt outcry against the revival of stock-exchange speculation, in which certain elements in the population have indulged with the first signal of industrial revival, has been reassuring. If the gambler can be snubbed and hounded into a degree of restraint, one of the greatest malignities of the old regime will be conquered. Even this one detail is a large order. When the many more essential reformations in social character are added to the reckoning, the course of the New Deal is found to be precarious, indeed.

But, we repeat, this, after all, is the way the business has got to be done. Millennial programs, whether dubbed socialism or what you will, are far more precarious, and, if instituted, must end in a collapse much more devastating than will be the reaction which even its best friends believe eventually awaits the New Deal.

JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE.

Growing Godward

Change, and not annihilation
In this garden of creation.
Not alone by bearing seed
Does man survive to meet life's need.
The oak, deep-clinging to the earth
To study oaklings shall give birth.
Yet its roots are one with soil,
And the branches ever toil
To claim an individual height,
Growing Godward by love's right.

MARIE FALCONER.

Gandhi Goes to Prison Again

The arrest and reimprisonment of Mahatma Gandhi by the British Raj on August 1, 1933, raises once again the fundamental question of the efficacy of Civil Disobedience. On the surface, Civil Disobedience has been beaten. In the present impasse between Gandhi and the government advocates of violence see a confirmation of their thesis that the British understand only the logic of the bullet. Faint murmurs are already heard that the Gandhi technique has failed. My loyalty to Mahatma Gandhi is one hundred per cent, but it is not in terms of a disciple of Gandhi that I propose to analyze the complex problems confronting India and England. It is in the spirit of a sociologist that I propose to set forth the interplay of various forces in the Hindese (Indian) scene of today.

To continue civil disobedience or not to continue it, that was the problem facing Mahatma Gandhi. Being the father of the movement, he could not very well disown it. Having been stirred to the very depths of his heart by the call to serve the lowly untouchables, he was anxious not to court imprisonment. At large he could abolish the course of untouchability from our midst before his earthly existence was done; in prison his usefulness to the cause would be severely curtailed. Even so, he might not remain at liberty if his lieutenants and nameless followers by the thousands were still kept behind prison bars. Nor would he disown India's right to civil disobedience despite threats of dire consequences by the British Raj.

Added to this complex situation was the ever-present danger of demoralization among the rank and file of the Congress party thanks to the incredibly severe repression and lathi raj conducted by the present administrators in India. How to resolve the dilemma of not disowning civil disobedience and at the same time of guiding the movement into ordinance-proof channels for the benefit of those who were tired of ordinance raj—this supreme question Gandhi had to answer.

A new program to achieve the selfsame objective of freedom for India has been Gandhi's answer. Signs have not been wanting of a gradual change in psychology and activity during Mahatma Gandhi's leadership of the movement for the past fourteen years.

The passive resistance movement of 1919 was succeeded by the non-violent non-cooperation movement of 1920-24. The non-cooperation movement was, in turn, supplanted by the civil disobedience campaign of 1930 to date. Early in 1930 Gandhi suggested to the writer that he would much rather have his movement known by the term "civil resistance." But inasmuch as the dominant psychology in 1930 was in favor of aggressive violation of government laws, neither the technique nor the concept of civil resistance had any chance to come to fruition. The difference between civil disobedience and civil resistance is that whereas in the former the attitude of the participants in the movement is that of aggressively disobeying laws and going against government proscriptions, in the latter the attitude of the participants is that of taking for granted the limitations imposed by the existence of an alien government and engaging in activities that would, without intentionally and aggressively violating the laws of the government, tend toward the weakening of the very structure of that government.

Addressing a group of his disciples in 1930 at the end of the historic march to the sea, Mahatma Gandhi said:

> There is no such word as defeat in the vocabulary of a Satyagrahist (a votary of Satyagraha or of civil disobedience). The Satyagrahist stands to gain both ways—either when he is permitted to work for his cause unhampered or when he is imprisoned for his activities.

It is important to recall that in May, 1930, Gandhi actually compelled the British Government to arrest him on pain of loss of British prestige by permitting the government salt works to be non-violently raided and taken possession of by Gandhi and his followers in the name of the people of India. In prison Gandhi became a stronger force for rallying the masses to his movement. At the end of nine months (March-December, 1930) even professed British die-hards admitted that India was as good as lost to the British Empire. But the well-entrenched and resourceful British Government could well afford to prolong the strife between the people and the government, what with borrowing monies from the London money market and what with unbridled repressive lathi raj.

To give the people a breathing spell Mahatma Gandhi entered into negotiations with Lord Irwin, the then Viceroy of India. As a result of the Gandhi-Irwin truce (March 5, 1931) which left the trump cards in the Mahatma's hands, the Congress party was represented at the Second Round Table Conference in London (September 14-December 1, 1931), in the person of the Mahatma himself. Then came a change in the administrative policy of the British Government. The Labor Government was overthrown, the so-called National Government came into power; the Laborite Col. Wedgwood Benn was succeeded by the Tory Sir Samuel Hoare as Secretary of State for India, not to speak of the high-handed Willingdon succeeding the conciliatory Irwin as Viceroy of India.

Within a week after his landing in India the British Government lodged Gandhi behind prison bars for an indefinite term, without trial (January 4, 1932). All the important lieutenants of Gandhi were likewise thrown into prison. The juggernaut car of the British government began to move relentlessly, crushing the weak and the strong, men and women, rich and poor, the known and unknown. At one time the number of Satyagrahists in prison rolled up to 100,000. The Nazi high-handedness in Germany is the very embodiment of mildness compared to the *zulum* (repression) of the British raj in India.

In April, 1932, Gandhi wrote letters from prison to Sir Samuel Hoare and Premier MacDonald outlining his unyielding position against the creation of separate constituencies for the untouchables. Sir Samuel assured Gandhi that his views would be taken into account; further, that the government would under no circumstances arrive at any definite decision until the Lothian Commission had reported upon it. In May the Lothian Commission made its recommendations with regard to franchise in India *discountenancing the creation of separate political constituencies for the untouchables*. In August, 1932, the British government announced the so-called MacDonald "Communal Award" which proposed to set up "Jim Crow" constituencies for the untouchables. Gandhi's "fast unto death" is now a matter of history, culminating in the British government's backing down and accepting the Poona Pact arrived at between the high-caste Hindus

and the untouchables. This pact, signed in the presence of the fasting Gandhi, under the spreading branches of the mango-tree in Yeravada Prison, laid down the principle of joint electorates for all Hindus, high-caste and low-caste, and guaranteed to the untouchables twice the number of seats promised by Mr. MacDonald.

II

Immediately Gandhi's interest began to center in the abolition of the evil of untouchability. Before he broke his fast the Mahatma had intimated to his people that if the implications of the pact were not fully carried out he would be compelled to declare a fast in protest. History records no parallel to the hurricane of rapidity with which the social reform movement for the uplift of the untouchables began to take root all over India. Between September, 1932, and May, 1933, when the Mahatma went on his twenty-one-day fast, hundreds of temples were thrown open to the untouchables all over the country; wells, formerly reserved for the high-caste Hindus, began to be thrown open to the untouchables; sidewalks and other public facilities were made available to these lowly creatures; schools began to admit untouchable children and new schools began to be established for the exclusive benefit of the untouchables. Gandhi rechristened these unfortunate kith and kin of ours; no longer to be referred to as untouchables, they are now, through Gandhi's initiative, called Harijans, i. e., "God's children." They are God's people, God's children, because they are befriended by none but God. The Hindu conscience has been awakened, and the social reform movement in behalf of the Harijans began to make progress by leaps and bounds.

Age-old institutions and inhibitions die slowly. Not all the high-caste Hindus were willing to admit Harijans to their fraternity on terms of equality. Added to the inertia of a certain section of Hindu orthodoxy there was the silent but effective opposition of the British government to this reform movement.

The boards of trustees of certain temples frequented by the elite of orthodox Hindus would deny Harijans admission, and their specious plea that the temples were private property was sustained by the present law governing British India. Thereupon, Gandhi's lieutenants, who were out of prison, framed two Bills—the Anti-Untouchability Bill and the Temple Entry Bill. One of the members of the Legislative Assembly sponsored these Bills, approved by Mahatma Gandhi, and gave notice to the government that opportunity be given for their introduction at the earliest possible moment. The purpose of the two Bills was merely to enunciate the principle that so far as the government was concerned, the caste status of the untouchables would be deemed no hindrance to their exercise of civic and social rights including entry into temples for purposes of worship. Their purpose was, in the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "merely to remove the (legal) deadweight."

Four months passed and yet the British government could not see its way clear toward permitting the introduction of these two salutary measures of social reform. Incensed at his impotence, lodged behind prison bars, Gandhi had to do something drastic in order to compel the wheels of the governmental machinery to move faster and to overcome the inertia of Hindu orthodoxy. This is the genesis of the twenty-one-day fast (May 8-29, 1933) which the Mahatma has so miraculously survived. Self-purification, the avowed object of the fast, transcends the limitations of objective social analysis. From the standpoint of social dynamics, the purpose of the fast may be said to be (again, in Gandhi's words, quoted from another context): "(1) to stir up sluggish consciences and (2) to fire loving hearts to action."

III

Since the 29th of May Gandhi had been recuperating from the effects of his self-imposed fast. By mid-July, almost completely recovered, he was ready to join the fray. Shall it be a continuation of civil disobedience or shall it be something else? The question has been answered definitely and decisively: (1) Mass Civil Disobedience must be called off; (2) Individual Civil Disobedience must be launched; (3) There shall be no compromise on the ultimate objective of the Congress, namely, the attainment of Swaraj (Self-Rule) by the people of India.

Does this mean that Gandhi is inconsistent? That he is timid? That he has betrayed his people? Or, does such a decision place Gandhi in the rank of the foremost political realists and social scientists?

Let us recall Gandhi's five-point program for the attainment of freedom enunciated in 1921: (1) Hindu-Muslim-Sikh-Christian-Jew-Parsee Unity; (2) Abolition of Untouchability; (3) Encouragement of Swadeshi, i. e., Home Industry, especially *via* the Spinning Wheel and the Handloom; (4) Abolition of the Traffic in Liquor and Opium; (5) Participation of Women in the Nation's Struggle for Freedom. "Carry out this five-point program," said Gandhi, "and you have Swaraj in the palm of your hand." Indeed, he likened the five points of his program to the five fingers of the hand and said that they were inseparable. The five fingers, joined to the hand, function as a unit; so do the five parts of his program, united in non-violence, function as a unit. Let any part of this program remain unfulfilled and Swaraj is chimerical, even if political freedom should dawn upon India.

The path to Swaraj is not strewn with roses even if impatient patriots should mix their metaphors and cry aloud from the house-tops that the millennium is at hand once the British are removed from India.

Much water has flowed in the Ganges since the five-point program was enunciated in 1921. Great progress has been made in every part of the program. The remarkable awakening among the women of India, their discarding of the veil and their participation in the Civil Disobedience campaign, bring pride to the Hindese (Indian) heart and command the admiration of the outside world. The home industries, especially *Khaddar* ("homespun") activities, are going on merrily despite government ban and Lancashire pressure. The consumption of liquor has considerably declined, bringing in its wake a fall in the government revenue, despite government opposition to the picketing of liquor and opium shops. In the ten years after 1921 Hindus and Muslims had been appreciably brought nearer together and some work had been done toward the removal of untouchability. But a great deal still remained to be done in those directions.

Plaintively the Mahatma said in his radio address (from London) to the American people (September 13, 1931):

> It is a matter of deep humiliation to confess that we are a house divided against itself, that we Hindus and Mussulmans

are flying at one another. It is a matter of still deeper humiliation to me that we Hindus regard several millions of our own kith and kin as too degraded even for our touch. I refer to the so-called "untouchables".

The Mahatma went on further to say:

These are no small weaknesses in a nation struggling to be free. And hence you will find that in this struggle through self-purification we have assigned a foremost place to the removal of this curse of untouchability and the attainment of unity amongst all the different classes and communities of India representing the different creeds. (Quoted from the present author's book: *"Gandhi Versus the Empire,"* page 168.)

Mahatma Gandhi is the sanest and most realistic statesman of our times, the protestations of Messrs. V. J. Patel, Subhas Chandra Bose & Company to the contrary notwithstanding. The man has a definite philosophy, a definite technique and a clear vision of the future. Of no other Indian leader, Moderate or Congressman, could this be affirmed.

The Anti-Communal League started by Dr. Alam (Muslim), a follower of Gandhi, is fighting the evil of communalism. Associated with Dr. Alam are Dr. S. K. Datta (Christian), Principal of the Forman Christian College, Lahore; Professor Ruchi Ram Sawhny (Hindu), Mr. S. Mangal Singh (Sikh), and others. Their creed may be summarized in Dr. Alam's words: "In politics you possess all as an Indian, but nothing as a Muslim, Hindu, Sikh or Christian." The rising spirit of nationalism among all sections of the people of India is to be ascribed to Gandhi's leadership. And the Anti-Untouchability campaign of Mahatma Gandhi is destined to purge Hindu society of this age-old evil. Thus the two weak links in the chain of Indian nationalism are in process of being reinforced: Fearlessness is Gandhi's gift to contemporary India, a gift the value of which it would be difficult to overstate.

IV

Granted that mass Civil Disobedience is called off, that the Congress remains adamant on its ultimate objective of Swaraj for India, what of the future? (1) Will Gandhi be disowned by his people? (2) Will the Congress be captured by the forces of violence? (3) Will the awakened mass of Indian humanity once again relapse into slumber and inertia? (4) What will be Gandhi's next move? (5) What will be the government's retort?

It is not difficult to answer these questions if Gandhi's psychology and technique are properly understood. No, the Mahatma will not be disowned by his people, impatient patriots to the contrary notwithstanding. The demon of violence will be kept in leash yet a while longer, thanks to Gandhi's dominance over the political scene. To consolidate the gains of the last few years the awakened mass of Indian humanity will be called upon to take up the constructive task of amelioration. The boundless energies of awakened India will be harnessed for the purpose of eradicating untouchability and "the drink and drug curse."

Gandhi's next moves are unmistakable. Already his Anti-Untouchability campaign has worked wonders. The erstwhile "untouchables" and "unapproachables" are being courted to enter the fold of Hinduism on a footing of equality with the rest. The social, political, economic and spiritual amelioration of forty million untouchables is a task worthy of the attention of the best among men. As soon as the untouchables give up eating carrion at the behest of Gandhi and his followers, they will be acceptable in the fold of higher Hinduism. As soon as they cease to indulge in liquor, toddy and opium, they will arouse the ire of the British government. For, the British government derives the handsome revenue of $85,000,000 from the traffic in drinks and drugs.

The Gandhi technique always impales the government on the horns of a dilemma. If the government permits Gandhi and his followers to ameliorate the condition of untouchables, the cause of nationalism will continue to prosper; if it does not, the awakened conscience of Hindus will revolt. If the government permits the propagation of temperance among untouchables—and among other sections of the population—it stands to lose considerable revenue; if it does not, the solid phalanx of Hindus and Muslims will be ready to pounce upon it, drink being taboo to both Islam and Hinduism. Turn wherever it might, the specter of the man in loincloth would haunt the British government. This impaling of the government on the horns of a dilemma I call the process of civil resistance.

The future possibilities may now be visualized. The government will be compelled to obstruct social reform work in behalf of the untouchables and in behalf of temperance. Gandhi and his followers will be obliged, in virtue of their principles, to prosecute their ameliorative activities in the face of government restrictions. Friction is bound to arise and Civil Resistance will easily slide back into Civil Disobedience. Whether and when Civil Resistance is to develop into mass Civil Disobedience will depend entirely upon the government. Gandhi will hold out as long as possible against a revival of mass Civil Disobedience but, when challenged, he would not be found wanting.

Civil Resistance will keep intact the bellicose attitude of the Satyagrahists. The fight would be transferred simply from the political front to the social front. Politics will be either left severely alone by the Congress or mildly participated in. Some Congressmen are apt to take to the politics of the White Paper brand in the footsteps of those government errand-boys, Sapru and Jayakar; others will discountenance all politics with the supreme conviction that a sham constitution does not spell Swaraj. To this overwhelming majority of people in the Gandhi camp Swaraj consists the fulfillment of the five-point program.

Conquering the citadels of untouchability and of the drink and drug evil would be no mean accomplishment—indeed, it will materially advance the cause of Swaraj.

If this analysis be correct, the Saint of Sabarmati appears in the guise of a shrewd statesman. Well, Gandhi is a shrewd statesman as well as a Saint of the very highest order. Saintliness does not consist in being a simpleton. Nor are saintliness and shrewdness incompatible. None but a saint with the qualities of a shrewd statesman could solve the dilemma confronting India.

V

The Mahatma's overtures for peace have been consistently rebuffed by the British Raj. In vindication of his stand Gandhi was compelled to resort to individual civil disobedience (August 1, 1933). The government's answer has been a prompt reimprisonment of Gandhi and thirty-two of his Ashramites. The suspension of civil disobedience by the Congress during the Mahatma's fast and extension thereof until the end of July at Gandhi's suggestion were meant to give the government an opportunity to reconsider its position. It

must be conceded that the British Raj has forced the Congress into a stalemate, if not into a checkmate. Flushed with a sense of victory won by incredibly harsh methods, the Raj wants the Congress to surrender completely before releasing political prisoners. The Mahatma wants an "honorable settlement," peace without victory on either side, and release of political prisoners.

That the Congress is the custodian of India's honor is admitted even by loyalist Moderates; that the humiliation of Congress would be tantamount to a humiliation of all India is the basic reason why the Moderates are pleading with the government for an honorable settlement. Says *The Servant of India* (Moderate) of Poona, June 29, 1933, editorially:

> The bitterness of humiliation will long sour the temper of the people, not only of avowed Congressmen but of most Indians; it will become an obsession with them, so much so that they may stop at nothing to hurl back the humiliation and retrieve their self-respect. The defeat of the congress will mean not merely the defeat of civil disobedience but of non-violence and even of constitutionalism.

Gandhi may be relied upon to make a strategic retreat but not to make an abject surrender. The technique of mass civil disobedience is thoroughly sound and capable of delivering the goods but at present it must be suspended in favor of individual civil disobedience. The reason for suspending mass civil disobedience under the aegis of the Congress is simple, and peremptory from Gandhi's standpoint. The trained leaders having been thrown into prison, the Congress has fallen into the hands of the lesser fry unschooled in the principle of non-violence and of open, civil defiance. Congress activities have been driven underground and are carried on by secret methods. Secrecy and underhand methods are the very antithesis of Gandhi's Soul Force. Hence the Congress must be purified before Civil Disobedience under its aegis becomes a success.

From the very outset Gandhi has kept strict control over the movement. It is instructive to recall the wording of the Congress mandate which gave Gandhi his "charter of freedom." In February, 1930, the Congress Cabinet invested the Mahatma with sole authority over the impending Civil Disobedience campaign in the following words:

> The Working Committee (i.e., the Congress Cabinet) welcomes the proposal of Mahatma Gandhi and authorizes him and those working with him, who believe in non-violence as an article of faith to the extent above indicated (i. e., for the purpose of achieving Purna Swaraj or complete independence), to start civil disobedience as and when they desire and in the manner and to the extent they decide.

The Congress contains in its organization the Gandhi type of strict votaries of non-violence; it also contains "those who accept non-violence as a policy essential in the existing circumstances in the country." Hence, "my difficulty was fundamental," wrote Gandhi in *Young India,* February 20, 1930. Continuing he said:

> I saw that I could not work out *Ahimsa* (non-violence) through an organization holding a variety of mentalities. *Ahimsa* could not be subject to the decision of majorities. To be consistent with itself it might have to be inconsistent with the whole world.
>
> A person who has a choice before him is ever exposed to temptation. The instinct of those, therefore, with whom non-violence is a policy, when tempted by violence, may fail them. On the other hand, the instinct of those who have no remedy but non-violence open to them can never fail them if they have non-violence in them in reality. Hence the necessity for freedom from Congress control.

Hence, one might suggest, Gandhi's initial defiance of the Salt Law in the spring of 1930 with the aid of 78 of his tried and trusted followers, members of his Ashram (Colony). Hence, also one might add, Gandhi's recent launching of individual civil disobedience with the aid of 32 of his Ashramites.

The launching of individual civil disobedience, entailing, as it has, the reimprisonment of Gandhi, is meant to achieve two things: (1) to reassert India's right to have recourse to civil disobedience in her fight for freedom; (2) to purify the Congress movement of secrecy and underground methods. The goal of Swaraj remains intact. Those who believe in non-violence merely as a policy will be called upon to devote themselves to the abolition of untouchability and the drink and drug evil, and thereby contribute their share toward hastening the dawn of Swaraj. Those who believe in non-violence as a principle of faith will be permitted to resort to civil disobedience whenever necessary, and court imprisonment. The stage is now set for a simultaneous war on two fronts—the social (reform) front and the political (Swaraj) front.

War or peace, the decision rests with the British government. Gandhi's cards are on the table. Should the government withdraw arbitrary ordinances and release political prisoners, the war on the political front might yet be averted. Under ordinance raj, sporadic acts of violence by impatient patriots, especially in Bengal, are not to be ruled out as a new factor in the complex Hindese situation, now that the Congress has officially decided to give up mass civil disobedience as a weapon in the fight for the attainment of Swaraj. Shall the Indo-British problem be solved by the method of conference or shall India be ruled by lathis, ordinances, bayonets and concentration camps until the complete collapse of the British Raj? Let England answer the question.

HARIDAS T. MUZUMDAR.

Britain's Thorn

"Mighty Britain rules the waves"—
Thus spoke the scribes of long ago;
Yet Britain finds her power taxed
To rule one dark-skinned foe.

A crisis brought him to the fore;
(As Britain to her sorrow learned)
A man opposed to tyranny
And honor falsely earned.

This wizened saint the Indians pray,
Will right a wrong that grows with years;
Will shed the yoke that bears them down
With sufferings and fears.

Unchristian Christian that he is,
All peoples praise his peaceful trend;
His dealings in a passive way
To gain a rightful end.

The prison walls that claim him now,
Are gateways for his spirit free;
The soil where ideals richly sown
Uphold his humble plea.

And though he die and soon be laid,
Among the ruins he sought to save,
His efforts will unshackle those
Who writhe within a living grave.

JERGEN B. OLSON.

A Unique Social Worker

A year ago Lois Cuglar was unheard of in social service circles in Chicago. Today she is a character about whom myths without number have sprung up. One story is that she lives with Negroes in order to get material for a book that she is writing. Another one, more modest, is that she is writing a thesis, although still another is that she already has a doctor's degree from the University of Berlin.

All these of course are equally unfounded. Purely and simply, Miss Cuglar is an unassuming, almost plain, young woman sincerely working out her own philosophy of life, doing the things she feels she is cut out for and doing them in her own direct way—the only way she knows.

The average person's first impression of her is bad. "Just another arty creature from Greenwich Village" is the expression that comes to mind. It is not until after Miss Cuglar has permitted you to draw her personality into the open that you can fairly estimate the width and depth of her mind. She is strangely reticent. You feel that she resents being put on the spot, so to speak. It is only by being almost brutal that she can be made to talk about herself, and then she is continually trying to direct the conversation into other channels.

"Let's not talk about that, it's too stupid," was the answer she made to a question asking how she originally came to feel as she does toward racial minorities. On being pressed, she explained that, as far as she can remember, her first reaction came when she was a little girl in the first grade. In her small home town on the St. Lawrence river in New York state, she played with a little Jewish girl and one day her teacher told her she shouldn't spend her time with that girl because she was a Jew. It was her first feeling of resentment towards anyone and it was directed not towards the little Jewish girl but towards the teacher! And she continued to play with her little friend!

Miss Cuglar taught at the Congregational School in Shanghai for a year. She returned to the States by way of Europe and this is probably the basis of the story of her European doctorate. She took some graduate work in education at the University of Chicago, "to learn the dope about taking I Q's," as she puts it. Previous to coming to Chicago a teaching job at Tubulu, just outside of Jackson, Mississippi, had opened up.

The two years she spent there convinced her that if an undistorted knowledge of the Negroes was to be had, it could be had only by teaching in one of the little villages in the back country. While waiting for such a job to develop she picked cotton and became identified not only with but *as* a Negro. Her big difficulty here, she explains humorously, was that she could seldom have a day to herself picking as the county superintendent of schools was continually calling upon her to substitute for a teacher who was ill or indisposed for the day. Then her opportunity came.

The first high school for Negro children in a certain county in Tennessee was just across the state line from Mississippi. The teacher there, two weeks after the opening of the school year, simply walked off the job without any explanation and the principal, hearing of Miss Cuglar, offered the post to her. As time progressed this principal began to find fault with her as she would not permit chicanery to go on in the school affairs wherever she was in a position to check it, and in an attempt to discredit her, he wrote to New York and then produced evidence to show that she was white and consequently forbidden by the laws of Tennessee to teach in a Negro school. His difficulty was that the citizens refused to accept his evidence!

Nevertheless, the school was not reopened the next year. (It had been put in as a political maneuver to capture the votes of the Colored.) Miss Cuglar borrowed money on her Life Insurance policies and conducted a private school. That year she brought up the average daily attendance from 11 to 26. And during the summer induced some friends in Washington to pledge $400.00 to finance the third year. But a telegram reached her in Chicago that the county was hiring a colored teacher for the high school and her plans for that year were at an end.

And that is the round-about story of not only who but what Miss Cuglar—not is, but was. She studied again at the University and a year ago, accepted a position as a case aide in the Unemployment Relief service. It is her identification with this organization that concerns us here.

On the near South Side of Chicago is located a tenement occupied by Negro families. This is rather an ancient structure but built of the stuff that made houses before the post-war boom forced a combination of materials literally "thrown together." Prior to the course of her duties at the Bridgeport station of the U. R. S., Miss Cuglar had occasion to visit some of the families that made their home in this building. She found, somewhat to her surprise, that a curious chain of circumstances had operated to produce a situation unique in all city experiences.

Poor collections, hard times in general, vacancies and such had made the investment in the building anything but a profitable venture to the owner. As a consequence, the owner decided to stop trying to collect rent and permitted tenants to live there rent free. The city had no interest in taking over the operation of any building that offered such doubtful promises of returns, so the families domiciled there were not molested. The Social Service agencies however were concerned over the living conditions.

There was a definite fire hazard. In addition to the failure of a water supply, the unpaid gas and electric light bills had caused the utilities to cut off their service but the tenants had found methods of tapping the wires and pipes "beyond" the meters. This was another potent source of a possible fire. The building was actually condemned above the 5th floor but the tenants refused to budge. They had been evicted so many times since the boom days of prosperity petered out that they had no intention of leaving behind them without some struggle at least, anything at all in the way of a roof over their heads.

Here was a situation to cause any social service worker concern. Almost two hundred families under a single roof with no water and only stolen gas or charcoal stoves to cook with. Where could the children of these families play but in the street? The

building was well constructed, it was fairly clean, it was near the Relief Station, and there was some vacant space. What would be more natural for a woman of Miss Cuglar's experience but to move in herself? All she needed was the consent of the owner and of the renting agent. This was readily given and the deed was effected.

Miss Cuglar's salary was very small indeed—$85.00 a month to be exact—so her expenditures were necessarily small. The first thing she bought was fifty feet of rope which she cut into skipping ropes. The children actually wore the stuff out skipping. She developed a cooperative spirit among the residents and encouraged them to keep the corridors clean. Water was carried from neighboring buildings and from the fire station nearby. Soon, Miss Cuglar had succeeded in having several home-made checker boards produced and she set the children to playing with bottle caps for markers. To many of the children this was an entirely new game. As many as fifty or sixty would be playing at a session and in order to relieve the monotony, the game was made progressive. This made a contest of it and added zest to the game. Later even a piano was bought, a second hand one. Mothers' classes were organized. Girls' and boys' hiking groups were formed. In a word, Miss Cuglar organized her own social settlement while carrying on a full time job to support herself.

And then some strange things happened. It came to be known among her fellow workers that she was living in the terrible Angelus building—with Negroes! Miss Cuglar's actual working knowledge of the families was severely ignored by the case worker who refused relief until they moved into another building where the station would pay one month's rent and give the new landlord the option of permitting the client to remain without paying rent or instituting eviction proceedings! The case worker's stand was supported by the organization because the U. R. S. "did not support institutions." As a consequence, only those remained who could manage somehow or other to eke out an existence without the aid of the unemployment relief service. It became a process of starving them out.

Miss Cuglar herself became a social problem of the organization. Here was an educated, presumably an intelligent, normal woman, debasing herself in the eyes of the clients, deliberately destroying the *esprit de corps*. For a moment the head of the Unemployment Relief Service forgot her years of work in social rehabilitation and demanded that Miss Cuglar change her place of residence. Miss Cuglar refused, but offered to tender her resignation any time it was desired. Almost a year later the demand was renewed. Again it was refused, more emphatically this time, and there was nothing left for the director to do but to prefer charges against Miss Cuglar before the director of the county bureau. Let it be said to the credit of that gentleman, that when he heard the story from the worker herself, he shook her hand and said, "Hang on to your ideals, you're doing a fine work."

Meanwhile, two academic satellites of social service who have fought and bled to save the Bureau of Public Welfare from the political spoilsmen, both of them of the University of Chicago, made a personal inspection of the building, and justly expressed their reaction to the horror of the living conditions obtaining there. Unfortunately, they do not control the political set-up in Chicago's city hall and the water remains shut off. The fire hazard likewise remains.

The special work division which provides part-time work to clients making it possible for those with large families to pay their rent and avoid the danger of eviction, cannot give their services to residents of the Angelus Building because of the technical fact that they do not pay rent. Those who get the work also pay gas and electric light bills with their funds. Obviously, if the people living in the Angelus Building had funds, they would not need to steal electric current and gas and the present fire hazard would be reduced. Likewise they could furnish the small sum needed to have the water turned on and pay for the future consumption. But rules are rules!

Lois Cuglar is losing her battle. But she enjoys a good fight, and this has been a good one. It isn't her first and it probably will not be her last. At any rate she has been true to herself and she is keeping up her ideals. Few of us can do even this in trying times such as these.

DORIS BAXTER.

[Note: Since the above was written, the manager of the Angelus has succeeded in getting the water turned on again. Some families have continued to get their relief throughout the struggle. The recreation room continues to function, not only for residents of the building but for neighbors in this disintegrating area. The boys are planning on a camping trip to Starved Rock, the girls are still skipping rope, and the mothers are piecing quilts against the inevitable coming winter needs.]

"Mother of God"

Mary, mother of Jesus—she trod the roads of Galilee. She carried jars of water from the well. She ground meal, she washed, she cooked, she spun wool, she mended.

Mary, wife of Joseph—she knew poverty. With the sweetness of a true mother she nursed a large family of sprawling children. Her womb opened, bringing life—children to play in the white sands of Nazareth's streets. She knew the pain of childbirth.

She knew the dull sorrow of unappreciative children. She watched her son, Jesus, leave the dusty carpenter shop. She knew his dreams and her heart was broken when he chose the world for his mother, his brothers, and his sisters. "What have I to do with thee?" he asked her, and her heart broke in two. Mary, mother of Jesus, she saw him clinging to a fierce cross of suffering.

Mary, wife, widow, mother, and friend—she knew the cruelty of earth and the pain of Heaven. Human, alive to sense, alive to dreams, dead to hope, they called her "Mother of God."

They made her a virgin. They dressed her in blue and lighted candles at her feet. They crowned her with misty haloes. They prayed to her, "Mother Mary, pray for us."

The irony of fate! What she bore in this life! And they made her the "Mother of God."

RAYMOND KRESENSKY.

The Study Table

Human Diversity

A strange book, a terrible book, but no doubt a great book, is Kasimir Edschmid's "South America: Lights and Shadows."[1] It is well to read it after you have read Thompson's "Greater America" and Bryce's "South America" and the entire list of Koebel's books. Lights and Shadows the author calls it but your reviewer confesses to seeing no "lights." Edschmid glories in the Inca and loves the Indio, but the Incas are gone and the Indio, though abundantly present, has not arrived. Together they do little to brighten the gloom. The machinery of the story is unusual and a little stiff in the joints. A strange young man, Goehrs, a brooding philosopher, is he who makes the journey and ponders over the findings. What would he? Is Leguia truly the desirable model? Or Gomez? Is anything desirable, or is everything at odds? Hating the "American" as heartily as does any southern, is there no escape? Is escape worth while? Goehrs loves scenery and Edschmid describes it in magical words. Goehrs goes through the continent and everywhere encounters the same natural beauty, the same basic population, the same uncertain mixture, the same bountiful nature, the same inadequate utilization, the same problem. Everywhere the problem and nowhere the solution.

Goehrs was aware that there were people who condemned the half-breed race root and branch. And on the other hand there were people who maintained that out of this intermingling of Indian heroism and Spanish daring, the new heroic race of the earth would spring. . . . Was this thin layer of half-breeds and this thin veneer of white men capable of genuinely creative initiative? Had they the capacity for moulding and conserving states? Or would this source of initiative be discovered one of these days in the lower Indian layer that still made in the main, "quite good fishermen," cattle herders, plantation hands and pack animals? Or would the mystic force that avails to elevate a people not come at all—and would the work of development simply be taken in hand by the Yankees?

The only hope held out in the direction of solution is Leguia and the Indian. The pity is that, long before the Indian rises to grapple with the situation, Leguia and his ilk will have sold the material for construction which belongs to him to the hated men of the North, who through efficient destructive exploitation will leave him but to starve. Should you read the book? Of course you should read it and re-read it. It will do more to start your thought processes than most books that you have read. But be prepared for shadows: you will find few lights.

A new life of Henry M. Stanley (John Rowlands), translated from the German of Jacob Wassermann, has appeared.[2] It is not to be expected that it will contain new material. Its excuse seems to be that the public of today thinks little of the great African explorer, in fact is almost forgetting him. Yet he was a famous figure in his day, only a few years back. His adventures were thrilling, his achievement was spectacular, his books were best-sellers. The name Bula Matari, "the stone breaker," was given to him by the natives of the lower Congo, when they were constructing for him the transport service of the lower falls of the great river. It was a fitting name for the man whose indomitable energy overcame obstacles before which most men would have succumbed. The material for a biography today must come chiefly from Stanley's Congo books and his "Autobiography," edited by his wife. His Congo books—"How I Found Livingston," "Through the Dark Continent," "The Congo and the Founding of Its Free State," "In Darkest Africa," six volumes in all—form a connected story of achievement. In the first three he was truly a conqueror; as to the last, opinion may be divided. His other writings have little significance either in themselves or as contributing to his life story. While there was no new material for Wassermann to use, he tells an interesting tale. On the whole his attitude is that of hero-worship, alas too infrequent in these hard days. The actually new thing about the book is that it introduces something of psycho-analysis—so far as we know a thing not heretofore applied to Stanley. Psycho-analysis is also applied to the mystery surrounding the rear-column left at Yambuya. The hint may be worth while, but in your reviewer's judgment falls short of demonstration. On the whole the Stanley depicted by Wassermann is a gentler, kinder, wiser Stanley than we usually visualize. There are those who look upon him as almost a brute, working hardship and instilling terror on the country through which he passed and rendering the travel of those who followed him more difficult and dangerous. Somewhere between the two conceptions lies the reality. It is a good thing to have the Stanley story retold and retold with admiration and enthusiasm. Today, between mighty hunters and advance agents of big business, Africa is being overrun and travel is easy. It is well to be reminded of the old Africa which he brought to knowledge.

The Methodist Episcopal Church commemorates the hundredth anniversary of the death of Melville B. Cox by the publication of a small book by Roger S. Guptill. It is entitled "Though Thousands Fall, the Story of Melville B. Cox"[3] and is intended for mission study groups. Melville B. Cox was the first missionary sent to a foreign field by that church. Born in Maine, he was one of twin boys, last children in a family of seven. The father died early and the boy was compelled to work for a living—first on a farm, later as a clerk in a bookstore. Converted at eighteen, he devoted himself to religious work—preaching, writing, editing. His health broke and for eight years he was fighting for life. The future was dark and uncertain. Against the advice of many, he decided to go to Africa as a missionary and was assigned to Liberia, then attracting considerable attention. His career there was short, little more than four months. He died there and was buried in the little cemetery in Monrovia, where his monument still stands. One of his last utterances was: "Let a thousand fall before Africa be given up." This has been the rallying cry of the Methodist Church for a hundred years. A book, "Remains of Melville B. Cox," was printed anonymously soon after his death. Five years later this was reprinted with additions and notes supplied by his surviving twin brother. These two books have supplied the material for the present book by Mr. Guptill, who is himself a missionary to Africa. The book is illustrated with a portrait and photo-reproductions representing the me-

1. "South America: Lights and Shadows," Kasimir Edschmid. New York: 1933. The Viking Press. 8 vo. pp. 408. Price, $5.00.

2. "Bula Matari. Stanley, Conqueror of a Continent," Jacob Wassermann. New York: 1933. Liveright, Inc. 8 vo. xvi, 351. Price, $3.00.

3. "Though Thousands Fall. The Story of Melville B. Cox," Roger S. Guptill. New York: 1933. The Methodist Book Concern 16 mo. pp. 94. Price, $0.25.

morial window in the home church at Hallowell, Maine, the Cox memorial building of the College of West Africa and the grave of Cox at Monrovia.

In "Myths and Ceremonies of the Mandans and Hidatsa,[4] Martha Warren Beckwith continues the report of her study of these two Plains tribes. The book is the twelfth of the Vassar College Folklore Foundation Publications. The earlier study was number ten of the series and in the present number the pagination is continued from it. We have little to add to what we said of the first part. The collector shows a deepening impression of the fact that the myths of a people are to be considered in their entirety, as parts of a united and coherent whole. She quotes her Hidatsa informant, who says:

> For these stories are like the branches of a tree. All go back to the main trunk. The old Indians who know the stories, if we relate a branch, can tell where it belongs in the tree and what comes before and what after.

She quotes two of the best students of our American Indians to much the same effect and illustrates by the drawing of a tree which shows the relationship of her stories. The trunk here seems to be the story of "Charred Body"; "Coyote" and "Twins" seem to be early offshoots, while "Bringing the Sun Down to Earth" is a late forking. An interesting feature which comes out clearly is that *rights* go with a story or a ceremony, through purchase or gift. Not everyone has the right to tell a story—only he who has received it from its owner. Thus Ben Benson says:

> Ever since that time the mystery has been given to one man and so on down the line. I am the thirteenth to own the mystery. My father was seventy-seven when he gave me the mystery and I was thirty-eight. I am now sixty-seven. I have been a leader several times in the eagle-trapping. At the lodge I give each one a name after something sacred in our race. This is my own mystery. I cannot tell mysteries which belong to others.

He then gives the names of the twelve holders of the mystery who had passed it down through the years until it came to him. Herein lies part of the difficulty that the collector has, in securing information and stories, as well as the propriety of expecting payment for the telling of a tale and the imparting of a ceremony. The Indian owner *paid well* for hearing and receiving, why should he pass it on gratuitously? Of course there may be transmission without cash payment. Thus, the woman with whom the wolf ceremony originated passed it on through the blood descent line.

> She . . . "lived as a virgin and was well respected by all. As she grew old she transferred the mystery to the daughter of a sister. . . . The niece asked her aunt if she too should live as a virgin and her aunt said No, that she should marry and hand down the rite to her daughter. From that time the rite was handed down from one woman to another until the time of the last ceremony.

In the present volume our author emphasizes the relation between myth and ceremony more strongly than before. These tribes have long attracted the attention of students and we find here a full bibliography and throughout the study comparisons are made and references to earlier works given.

Frances Toor knows and loves her Mexico. She has prowled into odd and out-of-the-way places and come into contact with real Mexican life. She has carried through seven volumes of *Mexican Folkways,* a quarterly magazine which has been filled with interesting and picturesque folk-material. Through it she has done more to make modern Mexican art—the art of Diago Rivera and Jose Clemente Orozco and Maximo Pacheco and the rest—known than has any other writer. She conducts studios where the traveler can secure examples of the work of these now well known and popular painters. In the summer sessions of the University of Mexico she has come into helpful contact with many of the American students in attendance. She has now published a handy guidebook,[5] which travelers will find practical and useful. There is no other like it. No time is wasted, no space is lost, in needless description or attempts at fine writing. It gives essentials. It tells what is worth seeing, how to get to it, what to do while there. The index is novel, sensible and convenient. Apparently the guide is to be issued annually. It is now quite up to date and will no doubt be kept so. Published in Mexico and set up by Mexican printers it contains many typographical errors, but these do not mislead and may easily be overlooked. The price is so little, that one can better afford to buy it than to go without it. Are you surprised at your reviewer's hearty approval? It is due to the fact that he knows and loves Mexico and wants those who go there to be satisfied with their visit. Frances Toor's Guide will help them to be so.

FREDERICK STARR.

4. "Myths and Ceremonies of the Mandans and Hidatsa," Martha Warren Beckwith. Poughkeepsie: 1932. Vassar College. 8 vo. pp. xi, 117-267. Price, $1.25.

5. "Frances Toor's Guide to Mexico." City of Mexico: 1933. (Apartado, 1994.) 16 mo. pp. 141. Price, $1.00.

A Book of the Prophets

It is pathetic to read on the jacket of this volume* that it is the gifted author's "last work," and in the prefatory note that "preparation . . . for the press was among the last tasks on which he was engaged." Dr. Martin was a gracious gentleman, a charming lecturer, and a great cultural and moral teacher. One feels poor at the thought that his work is done.

The essays, or rather lectures, in this book are excellent specimens of what Dr. Martin offered his large audiences in New York and other cities. The two on Jeremiah and Erasmus stand as they were prepared for and delivered on the public platform. The other four, on Socrates, St. Francis, Carlyle, and Emerson, were revised and expanded for publication. A comparison between the revised and unrevised chapters offers an interesting study in literary art. It is impressive to see, in his task of revision, how easily and abundantly Dr. Martin was able to draw on his rich stores of information.

The character and value of this book may be best summed up by saying that it is fundamentally a work of appreciation. In each essay there is enough biographical material to give structure to the whole, but the rather commonplace details are quickly clothed, as bones by flesh, by the warm, living substance of the author's interpretation. His choice of subjects reveals his interest not in action, nor yet even in literary or artistic achievement, but in the rare essence of the spirit. These great leaders all exemplify those inner qualities of soul which comprise transcendent virtues and deep vision of reality. What begins so heroically with Jeremiah ends triumphantly with Emerson. Of all these men may be said what Matthew Arnold said of the Concord sage—"He was the friend and aider of those who would live in the spirit."

J. H. H.

*"Great Moral Leaders," by Alfred W. Martin. Published by the International Press, New York. $1.50.

Correspondence

The Crazy Farm Bill

I

Editor of UNITY:

What you say about the Farm Bill being the craziest piece of legislation ever enacted in the history of this country is worthy of most favorable comment.

The Agricultural Department never took any notice whatsoever when the low prices the farmer was receiving for his products were driving him more hopelessly into bankruptcy every day? Last week, however, just as soon as our gamblers and the board of trade operators were in danger of being wrecked, the situation was very different and the price was spiked to save their skins. Of course, this spiking helped the farmers but it was not done for the sake of helping the farmers. The price was spiked only to help our gamblers. The governnment considers the gamblers but not the farmers.

There has to be eventually set prices on the farmer's products, just as the government is trying to set prices for different kinds of labor, but somehow our legislators and executives never think of the farmer except when they are trying to get into office by procuring his vote. The reason our legislators and officeholders will not set prices for the farmer's products is because taking such action would put the grain exchanges out of business. This board of trade is composed entirely of parasites who live on the fat of the land, perform no services whatsoever, and are in consequence a constant tax on industry. They should be done away with. Setting prices would do that immediately, just as setting grain prices did during the War. This was done then in order to curtail the farmer's profits, though no such steps were taken in any other industry.

Secretary of Agriculture Wallace once wrote me that setting prices would be very difficult and complicated. It was not very difficult to do this last week. It just took a few moments; just long enough to write the order.

The Allotment Plan is the most fantastic idea ever hatched by mortal mind, and will result in more corruption, unfairness and expense than anything yet attempted.

C. L. PETERSEN.

St. Louis, Missouri

II

Editor of UNITY:

One of the bold measures that the Roosevelt Administration is carrying forward involves the plowing under of some nine million acres of cotton. Another seeks a 20 per cent reduction in the acreage of the 1934 wheat crop; and similar restrictions in production are contemplated in other industries. But before we proceed far with policies that tend to curtail employment as well as production we ought to be sure of our facts. For if the world is producing now no larger crops than would be consumed under normal conditions it is plain that we ought to seek some other means of helping the farmer. The same rule, of course, should govern in other industries.

Taking the average world production of wheat for three seasons beginning with that of 1893-94 and comparing with the average for three seasons beginning with 1911-12, we find that during the 18-year interval there was an increase of 57 per cent in production. The price of wheat during the same interval rose 34 cents. Comparing our average production for the three latter seasons mentioned with the average for three seasons beginning with 1929-30, we find an increase of only 18 per cent in production. Since the wheat price rose in the early 18-year interval it is hard to believe the modest increase in production in late years was the cause of the drastic fall in price. I have been surprised to find also that world production of sugar, cotton, wool, coal and pig iron has increased much more slowly in the past 18 years than in the earlier period, when prices were rising.*

Monetary conditions and the lack of purchasing power among the masses must account for the fall in prices. As far back as January, 1928, when business was supposed to be booming, there were already some four million unemployed workers in the country, chiefly as the result of the substitution of machines for human labor. We ought to have seen that decreasing employment meant a decrease in purchasing power. Can we remedy matters now by curtailing production in our leading industries, thus nullifying any advantage from the shorter work day?

One inclined to be facetious would say that the program for limiting production will at least relieve unemployment among political job-seekers by setting a veritable army of them at work to administer it. One writer estimates that the program as applied to wheat alone will require the services of 10,000 to 20,000 officials. We can be sure that this policy will prove to be expensive, and its benefits doubtful.

I believe agricultural prices could be stabilized if the government would carefully compute an average cost of production for each of the chief grain crops and for cotton, then buy the surplus at this cost price and store for future need, and fix a selling price at a reasonable margin above cost. This would discourage the growing of these crops on land not well adapted. The plan should work out successfully provided we have a stabilized dollar, such as Mr. Roosevelt hopes to establish. It was the appreciating dollar that wrecked the Hoover Farm Board program.

F. S. KINDER.

Denver, Colorado

*The statistics from which most of these comparisons were made may be found in the yearbooks of the U. S. Department of Agriculture.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 326)

the famous Geneva paper, the *Journal de Geneve.*"

Aristide Briand, late French foreign minister, once said: "Pens which write against disarmament are made of the same steel as that from which the guns are made."

Again, there are various technical difficulties. What are munitions and what not? Ammonium nitrate is a good fertilizer. It is also an explosive. Is cotton an instrument of war before it becomes nitro-cellulose? Silk may be used for armor. Automobile factories can turn out tanks on short notice; steel foundries may make armored cars as easily as bridges; a sewing-machine plant becomes a rifle factory after a simple change in the dies.

Nevertheless, a good deal of sentiment against the arms traf-

fic is slowly achieving practical expression.

Both ex-President Hoover and President Roosevelt have advocated an arms embargo. In April the French radical socialist deputy, Guernot, laid a resolution before the chamber to forbid the sale of arms by firms located in countries refusing to accept the recommendation of the League of Nations settlement of conflicts. The British government already operates a system of export licenses. The French government has created a commission to study means of regulating the manufacture and sale of war material in France.

The League of Nations has been occupied with the arms traffic problem almost from the beginning. The last development was a suggestion by Sir Eric Drummond in May, 1933, that the methods used in supervision of the drug traffic might also be used for arms.

Thirty-nine countries have answered a questionnaire about private arms traffic, but the answers have not been made public so far, not even to the disarmament conference.

The league publishes, nevertheless, a valuable annual handbook which is an inexhaustible mine of information about arms sales, "The Statistical Yearbook of Trade in Arms and Ammunition." This and the publications of the Union of Democratic Control, London, of which Premier Ramsay MacDonald was a founder, have been heavily drawn on for the international matters dealt with in this series.

The Brussels act of 1890 was the first recorded international effort to control the arms traffic. It forbade exports of arms to certain parts of Africa. Abyssinia and Afghanistan have been the subjects of partial arms bans. In 1919 eleven countries signed the China arms embargo, but enormous smuggling nullified most of its effect and it was lifted in 1929. Germany and Russia did not sign until 1928 and Czechoslovakia never.

In 1919 the convention of St. Germain was signed by twenty-three countries, but it never came into force. It provided that no state should allow the export of arms except to the recognized government of another state.

In 1925 a full-fledged arms traffic conference met at Geneva, attended by fifty-four nations, including the United States. After laborious sittings it produced a draft report, but so hedged in by compromises, evasions and qualifications that it was not much use. It did, however, embody a protocol forbidding poison gas and bacteriological warfare, which is theoretically in force. The main report comes into effect only when fourteen powers ratify. Thirteen have done so.

Then the disarmament conference now sitting, tackled the problem. The 1925 convention has been more or less dropped and the work is being done again from the beginning—it is hoped freshly and with more chance of producing a really effective instrument.—*John Gunther* in Chicago *Daily News*.

A Correction

Owing to translation two errors will be found in article on "Pacifism in Czecho-Slovakia" in UNITY for June 26th. Sentence beginning on sixteenth line in second paragraph on page 276 should read "But besides this, Jugo-Slavia has strained relations with Italy, Roumania *with* Russia." The last sentence in the same paragraph should read: "As a basis of economic cooperation the "Little Entente" is of no value, for the Czech farmers fear the competition of agricultural countries, such as our new allies, and will not open the tax-walls for their land products."

Borrow trouble for yourself if that's your nature, but don't lend it to your neighbors.—*Kipling*.

For September-October

The New Humanist

HARRY ELMER BARNES

asks

Has History Value to Humanism?

Also

IRVING BABBITT AND HIS FUNDAMENTAL THINKING
by Alexander P. Cappon

CAN ROOSEVELT SOCIALIZE AGRICULTURE AND INDUSTRY?
Roland R. Renne

The Philosophy of the Sciences
Maynard Shipley

What the Manifesto Lacks
George R. Dodson

Scientific Method in Haydon's Religion
Gabriel Rombotis

When Physicists Philosophize
Arthur E. Murphy

THE NEW HUMANIST One dollar a year
Bi-monthly
Foreign $1.25
105 S. Dearborn Street
Chicago

"There is valuable material in this journal which I do not find elsewhere."
John Dewey.

La Follette's
Great National Weekly Newspaper
THE PROGRESSIVE

In every issue it is fighting your battles against monopoly and organized wealth in government

SPECIAL OFFER
4 Months
— 21 — ISSUES
50c

STARTLING facts suppressed by other papers will be revealed in the next few issues. Send 50 cents today and be sure to receive the next extraordinarily interesting issues of La Follette's great weekly newspaper.
The Progressive, Dept. B., Madison, Wis.

Help India's struggle for freedom by non-violence! Help us offset British propaganda and meet Gandhi's request for moral support from America.

Join the American League for India's Freedom, John Haynes Holmes, chairman.

Tear off and return:

American League for India's Freedom
383 Bible House
New York City

Count me in as a supporter of India's struggle for independence. Here are my membership dues $.....

Name .....

Date .....Address.....